

**CLARK COUNTY**

**20 YEAR**

**COMPREHENSIVE**

**MANAGEMENT**

**PLAN**

**Capital Facilities**

**Financial Plan**

**( 2003-2008)**

**REVISED**

**DECEMBER**

**2003**

**CLARK COUNTY**  
**20 YEAR GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**  
**ADOPTED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCIAL PLAN:  
2003-2008**

**DECEMBER 2003**

## **CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCIAL PLAN: 2003-2008**

This document presents a plan for financing capital facilities identified in the Clark County 20 Year Growth Management Comprehensive Plan. This document is part of the supporting documentation to the Plan that was adopted by the Clark County Board of Commissioners on December 20, 1994 and which is reflected in Ordinance 1994-12-47. This document has been updated as part of the revised Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by the Clark County Board of Commissioners on December of 2003 under ordinance 2003-12-.....? The other supporting documentation associated with the Plan includes (1) the capital facilities plans for the school districts, Clark County Parks and Transportation; and (2) a summary of the vacant lands analysis for each of the urban growth areas.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Purpose and Scope</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Expenditures &amp; Earmarked Funding</b>	<b>7</b>
• <b>Transportation</b>	<b>8</b>
• <b>Parks and Open Space</b>	<b>9</b>
• <b>Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality</b>	<b>10</b>
• <b>Wastewater Treatment</b>	<b>10</b>
• <b>County Buildings and Other Facilities</b>	<b>12</b>
• <b>Summary</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>General Purpose Funding</b>	<b>15</b>
• <b>Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)</b>	<b>15</b>
• <b>Fund Balance</b>	<b>16</b>
• <b>Summary</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Policy Implications</b>	<b>17</b>
• <b>Implementation Action Needed</b>	<b>17</b>
• <b>Long Term Financial Impact</b>	<b>17</b>
• <b>Budget Implications</b>	<b>17</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents a plan for financing capital facilities identified in Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as required by Washington State's Growth Management Act (GMA). It covers the following types of capital facilities: transportation; parks and open space; stormwater drainage and water quality; wastewater treatment; and County buildings and other facilities. The plan covers the six-year period from 2003-2008.

The plan provides for:

- Expenditures totaling \$426.8 million over the 2003-2008 period
- Earmarked resources, such as grants, user fees, voter-approved bonds and legally dedicated revenues, to finance over 80% (or \$180.0 million) of the expenditure program.

The following table summarizes the expenditures and resources included in this plan:

<b>Executive Summary Table:</b>			
	<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Earmarked Sources</b>	<b>General Sources</b>
Transportation	156,070,500	78,269,500	0
Parks & Open Space	119,100,000	44,000,000	0
Stormwater Drainage & Water Quality	9,300,000	9,300,000	0
Wastewater Treatment	50,000,000	0	50,000,000
County Building & Other Facilities	92,365,000	48,465,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>426,835,,500</b>	<b>180,034,500</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>
Detail of General Sources:			
Fund Balance			5,900,000
Real Estate Excise Tax (Existing)			<b>17,241,911</b>
Real Estate Excise Tax (New)			<b>17,241,911</b>
<b>Total General Sources</b>			<b>40,383,822</b>

Like any long-term plan, the financing plan laid out in this document depends upon a number of forecasts and assumptions about future conditions. As time passes, it is expected that this plan will be modified and updated to reflect changing circumstances and financial realities. Year-by-year implementation of the plan will be carried out within the County's budgeting process and other appropriate processes.

## PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Washington State's Growth Management Act (GMA) sets forth the requirements for local growth management plans. One of the requirements is for a capital facilities plan, which must include a "...a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes..." The capital facilities plan for Clark County encompasses chapters 3, 6, and 8 of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (CGMP), along with relevant portions of other supporting documentation. This document is intended to identify funding sources for the principal capital facilities provided by Clark County itself.

Since this document is strictly financial in nature, it does not directly address capital facilities constructed by the private sector and subsequently donated to the County. Examples of such facilities include local streets constructed within subdivisions, local sewer hookups, and on-site stormwater detention facilities serving new development. Such facilities are indirectly, addressed in that their existence mitigates the need for impact fees or system development charges to construct them.

This document is also restricted to capital costs. It does not attempt to address issues relating to the need for ongoing maintenance and operation of capital facilities. These issues will be addressed in the County's biennial annual budgeting process.

This document focuses on the six-year time frame required by the Growth Management Act, specifically the years from 2003 to 2008. However, long-range 20-year projections of expenditures and resources are available elsewhere for most types of facility. For this information, see the CGMP and its supporting documents.

This document is chiefly intended to demonstrate the overall financial feasibility of the County's capital facilities plan, so it does not contain detailed, project-level information. For this information, refer to the CGMP and its supporting documents.

Financing for facilities provided by entities other than Clark County, such as the cities within the County, school districts and fire districts, can be found in the CGMP and its supporting documents.

This document is not intended to provide a year-by-year spending plan or cash flow analysis. Nor does it address the specific structure or timing of bond issues, where new debt is called for. These details should be developed during the County's annual budgeting process or through other appropriate processes.

Finally, this document represents a long-range plan, and, thus, may be revised as appropriate to reflect changing financial conditions and the changing needs of the community.

The information presented in this document is based on data provided by County staff in both oral and written form. Because this is a long-range planning document, rather than a budget, dollar amounts have been rounded to the nearest \$100,000.

## **EXPENDITURES AND EARMARKED RESOURCES**

The following pages show the planned expenditure levels for each type of capital facility along with funding sources that are earmarked for each facility type. For example, the Transportation section shows planned expenditures for road construction, along with road-related grants and traffic impact fee revenues, which may be used to finance those expenditures.

For some facility types, the earmarked resources are sufficient to finance the entire expenditure program. In other cases, general-purpose resources are needed to supplement the earmarked sources. (Sources of general purpose funding are discussed in the following section.)

Some of the earmarked revenue sources already exist. Examples include road fund property taxes, transportation and park impact fees, and the proceeds of the conservation futures bond issue. Other sources, such as certain grants, have not yet been received, but are expected without the need for major action on the part of the Board of County Commissioners. Finally certain earmarked sources described in this section will not materialize without specific action by the Board. These are identified in the following pages.

Expenditures outlined in this section are divided into those related to “existing needs” and those resulting from “new development.” This categorization is approximate, and is based upon information included in the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. The basis for categorization is identified for each facility type. Revenue sources are similarly classified for each facility type.

## (1) Transportation

Clark County's transportation infrastructure needs and standards are outlined in Chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. The County's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (2003-2008) serves as the capital facilities plan for roads. The TIP identifies individual projects, their expected costs, and anticipated funding sources. This information is summarized in Table 1, below:

<b>Table 1: Transportation</b>			
	<b>Existing Needs</b>	<b>New Development</b>	<b>Total</b>
Road Construction Projects	78,269,500	77,801,000	156,070,500
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>78,269,500</b>	<b>77,801,000</b>	<b>156,070,500</b>
Traffic Impact Fees*	0	13,997,000	13,997,000
Road Construction Grants	0	63,804,000	63,804,000
Other Road Fund Revenue	78,269,500	0	78,269,500
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>78,269,500</b>	<b>77,801,000</b>	<b>156,070,500</b>
<b>General Purpose Funding Needed</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Existing Needs and New Development:

Clark County has in place a system of transportation impact fees based on analysis of the road service levels and the impact of new development on the transportation network. On this basis, project costs totaling \$77.8 million are allocated to "New Development." These costs are financed with a mix of traffic impact fees and road construction grants. The remainder of the construction program, totaling \$78.2 million, reflects existing transportation needs and the public share of impact fee-funded projects.

### BOCC Action Needed:

No extraordinary action by the Board of County Commissioners is needed to implement the funding sources included in this portion of the plan.

### Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Resources Needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: none
- Non-General Obligation Debt needed: none

\*The public share of impact fee-financed projects, reflecting the portion of those projects allocable to current demand, is included in the "Existing Needs" column of this table.



## (2) Parks and Open Space

Clark County's standards and needs for parks and open space are outlined in Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, which also includes the capital facilities plan for parks. The capital facilities plan identifies individual acquisitions and development projects, as well as ongoing allocations for major capital repairs and improvements to existing parks. It also identifies anticipated funding sources for each project. The parks and open space program is summarized in Table 2, below:

<b>Table 2: Parks and Open Space</b>			
	<b>Existing Needs</b>	<b>New Development</b>	<b>Total</b>
Urban Parks (Acq and Dev)	18,900,000	13,700,000	32,600,000
Regional Facilities (Acq and Dev)	75,000,000	10,100,000	83,500,000
Existing Park Repair & Improvement	1,400,000	0	1,400,000
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>95,300,000</b>	<b>23,800,000</b>	<b>119,100,000</b>
REET	24,400,000	0	24,400,000
Grant Revenue	29,600,000	0	29,600,000
Donations and Partnerships	5,800,000	0	5,800,000
State & Federal	28,000,000	0	28,000,000
Conservation Futures / Areas **	5,000,000	10,100,000	15,100,000
Park Impact Fees* (acq. And dev)	0	13,700,000	13,700,000
County Local Share (acq.)	2,500,000	0	2,500,000
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>95,300,000</b>	<b>23,800,000</b>	<b>119,100,000</b>
<b>General Purpose Funding Needed</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Existing Needs and New Development:

As with roads, above, the use of impact fees as a funding source has been taken as an estimate of the effect of new development, as distinct from existing park needs. The parks capital facilities plan is envisioned as a first stage of a twenty-year acquisition and development program intended to meet the existing park and open space needs of the community. Needs associated with new development during that twenty-year period will be met as they arise, using, in part, impact fees as a funding source.

### BOCC Action Needed:

To fully implement the plan outlined in Table 2 above, the Board of County Commissioners must establish a funding mechanism for the Conservation Areas Acquisition Program to protect regionally significant open spaces and farmland.

### Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Resources needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: none
  - Non-General Obligation Debt Needed: none

\*The public share of PIF funded projects, representing the portion of the project allocable to current demand, is included in the "Existing Needs" column of this table.

\*\* It is estimated that the remaining Conservation Futures capacity will expire by the end of 2005, at which time alternative funding would be needed to pursue additional conservation acquisitions.

### (3) Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality:

The following is a discussion of the funds available for stormwater improvements and potential future costs.

Stormwater water quality improvements are funded through the Clark County Clean Water Program or (CWP), which is funded through an annual fee charged to owners of property with impervious surfaces. The fee is \$33.00/3,500 square feet of impervious area, which is the assumed amount for a single-family home (Equivalent Residential Unit) or (ERU). Commercial and industrial sites are billed by increments of 3,500 Square Feet of actual impervious area. This fee will raise approximately \$9.0 million every two years for overall clean water program. Of this amount, approximately \$3.4 million is available for capital design, operation and maintenance, right-of-way, and construction. At the time of this writing, there is in addition, a reserve of approximately **\$7.0 million**, which may be available for capital work.

In addition, there are funds spent on stormwater mitigation for road construction.

The six-year capital facilities plan for storm water and water quality has a greater potential for variation and adjustment over the six-year period covered.

### (4) Wastewater Treatment:

The capital facilities plan for Clark County's wastewater treatment facilities appears in the Master Plan/Engineering Report for the Phase III Expansion Program. This document described the improvements required for the Phase III Expansion was implemented and the Phase IV Expansion (to 16.0 mgd). The Phase III Expansion was implemented over the period 1993-1999. The County is currently beginning the planning process for the Phase IV Expansion. Early estimates of the Phase IV Expansion program costs are defined in the table below based on current available information:

<b>Table 4: Wastewater Treatment</b>			
	<b>Existing Needs</b>	<b>New Development*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Interceptor	0	10,100,000	10,000,000
Pump Station	0	5,300,000	5,300,000
Forcemain	0	3,300,000	3,300,000
Treatment Plant	0	24,800,000	24,800,000
Outfall	0	6,500,000	6,500,000
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>
Wholesale Customers (Bonds)	0	50,000,000	50,000,000
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>
<b>General Purpose Funding Needed</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

The "Wholesale Customers" line in Table 4 represents payments from the County's wholesale wastewater treatment customers (the Hazel Dell Sewer District and the City of Battleground). Presumably, the initial financing will be accomplished by issuing revenue bonds backed by customer payments. The wholesale customers will pass the cost on to their ratepayers by charging system development charges (SDCs) for new hookups and/or by adjusting monthly sewer rates.

**Expiring Needs and New Development:**

Clark County's sanitary sewer system is roughly adequate to meet existing demands. Further sewage treatment plant expansions are planned chiefly to address the needs of new development. \$50 million expansion of the plant to a capacity of 16.0 million gallons per day (mgd) will meet the forecast demand for the next ten to twenty years.

**BOCC Actions Needed:**

The program shown in Table 4 assumes that major sewer facility expansions will be financed with revenue bonds, and that those bonds will be paid from revenue received from the County's wholesale wastewater treatment customers. To implement the plan, it will be necessary to ensure that the rates charged by the County to its wholesale customers are adequate to repay the bonds.

**Financial Impact Summary:**

- General Purpose Resources needed: none
  - General Obligation Debt needed: none
  - Non-General Obligations Debt needed: \$50.0 million
- 
- The "zero" values shown in the "Existing Needs" column reflects the assessment that the current treatment facility is adequate to meet existing demand. However, the actual distribution of costs between system development charges (SDCs) and ongoing sewer rates will be determined by the County's wholesale customers, not by the County itself.

## (5) County Buildings & Other Facilities:

Chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan outlines the County's plans for new, expanded, and renovated facilities. These include a County service center, expanded detention facilities for both adult and juvenile offenders, and other projects. The financial impacts of the projects falling within the 2003-2008 timeframe are summarized in Table 5, below:

<b>Table 5: County Buildings &amp; Other Facilities</b>			
	<b>Existing Needs</b>	<b>New Development</b>	<b>Total</b>
Public Service Center/Parking Garage	35,699,000	0	35,699,000
Courthouse Remodel	5,191,000	0	5,191,000
Franklin Center Remodel	795,000	0	795,000
Warehouse Space	3,000,000	0	3,000,000
1408 Franklin Remodel	3,000,000	0	3,000,000
VA Campus Development	0	25,000,000	25,000,000
CRESA Building Expansion	780,000	0	780,000
Clark County Exposition Center	0	18,900,000	18,900,000
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>48,465,000</b>	<b>43,900,000</b>	<b>92,365,000</b>
Rent Savings	6,000,000	0	6,000,000
Earmarked Sources	780,000	43,900,000	43,900,000
General Obligation Bonds	41,685,000	0	41,685,000
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>48,465,000</b>	<b>43,900,000</b>	<b>92,365,000</b>
<b>General Purpose Funding Needed</b>	<b>184,730,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>184,730,000</b>

Note: General Purpose Funding Needed identified as current capital fund balances.

### Existing Needs and New Development:

The Comprehensive Growth Management Plan does not identify the portions of the building and facility program that are attributable to existing needs and to new development. In this presentation, the full amount is shown simply as "existing needs."

Existing needs include the carryover and completion of projects that began prior to 2003. New development includes the housing of Clark County's social service functions and other non-profit providers combined with the federal Veteran's Affairs in one location.

The "Clark County Exposition Center" is a new facility that the county is constructing. The projected cost of the facility, including soft costs, is estimated to be \$18.9 million. It will be paid for, on temporary basis, by the issuance of a BAN (bond anticipated note) scheduled for March 2004. Permanent financing will be accomplished through the issuance of bonds in 6 to 18 months from now. Identified sources of revenue to pay the debt service related to the project include:

- Amphitheater rent
- Leasehold excise tax from the amphitheater lease
- Lodging tax revenue
- PDF (public facilities district) sales tax revenue
- Net operating income from the exposition center
- Revenue repaid to the County PFD from the City PFD on the downtown conference center project

**BOCC Action Needed:**

No extraordinary action the Board of County Commissioners is needed to implement the funding sources included in this portion of the plan.

- **Financial Impact Summary:**
- General Purpose Revenue needed: \$184.7 million
- General Obligation Debt needed: none
- Non-General Obligation Debt needed: none

## (6) Summary:

Table 6, below, consolidates the information presented in Tables 1 through 5:

<b>Table 6: Summary of Expenditures &amp; Earmarked Funding</b>			
	<b>Existing Needs</b>	<b>New Development*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Transportation	78,269,500	77,801,000	156,070,500
Parks and Open Space	95,300,000	23,800,000	119,100,000
Stormwater Drainage & Water Quality	9,300,000	0	9,300,000
Sanitary Sewers	0	50,000,000	50,000,000
County Building & Other Facilities	48,465,000	43,900,000	92,365,000
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>231,334,500</b>	<b>195,501,000</b>	<b>426,835,500</b>
Earmarked Funding (All Sources)	246,801,000	195,501,000	180,034,500
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>246,801,000</b>	<b>195,501,000</b>	<b>180,034,500</b>
General Purpose Funding Needed	246,801,000	0	246,801,000

The capital facilities program for all five facility types total \$426.8 million over the period from 2003 to 2008. Of this, \$180.0 million will be financed with the “earmarked” funding sources discussed above. The remaining \$246.8 million will be financed from general purposes funding sources, which are discussed in the next section of this document.

### BOCC Action Needed (Recap):

To implement the plan outlined in Table 6, the Board of County Commissioners must:

- Establish a funding mechanism for stormwater and water quality facilities, such as a county-wide utility
- Ensure that charges to the County’s wholesale wastewater treatment customers are adequate to repay bonds issued to finance plant and system expansion.

### Financial Impact Analysis (Totals):

- General Purpose Resources Needed: \$246.8 million
- General Obligation Debt needed: \$0 none
- Non-General Obligation Debt needed: \$50.0 million

## GENERAL PURPOSE RESOURCES:

To complete the financing of its overall capital facilities program, Clark County must allocate an additional \$246.8 million from its general-purpose resources.

In prior capital facilities plans, available resources included the Real Estate Excise Tax to pay for capital improvements of County Buildings and Facilities (.25%) and for Park Development (.25%). In 2002, the Board of County Commissioners re-enacted the second REET splitting the percentage 50/50 for Park Development and Economic Development. Together, both of these resources are committed to existing capital needs over the period covered by this capital facilities plan. Future resources generated by the County Buildings and Facilities REET may be sufficient and available for buildings and facilities. REET is a tax on the sale of real property and can be volatile depending on economic and market conditions.

However, prior balances have been used to pay for prior capital needs. Available resources include the existing .25% Real Estate Excise Tax (REET); an additional .25% REET authorized by the Growth Management Act specifically to finance capital projects; and accumulated fund balance. Combined, these sources will provide adequate funding for the County's capital facility needs.

Sufficient and available resources will not be sufficient to pay the long-term costs associated with Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality capital needs. The current fee of \$33.00/3,500 square feet of impervious area pays for the costs of improving water quality. An additional estimated \$9.3 million will be necessary to fund stormwater capital needs in the Salmon Creek/Lakeshore basins, flooding, water quality, and habitat improvements in the Lacamas basin, as well as the pockets throughout the remainder of the urban area. Establishing a funding mechanism will be necessary to address these needs.

The mix of funding shown in this section depends upon forecasts of available revenues. It may therefore be necessary to modify the funding strategy in future years to accommodate unanticipated economic conditions.

### (1) Real Estate Excise Tax (REET):

The Growth Management Act, as amended by the legislature, identifies the local Real Estate Excise Tax as a capital funding option for local governments. It also gives localities the authority to levy a second .25% REET, in addition to the .25% authorized by prior legislation.

Table 7, below, reflects estimated REET collections covered by this plan.

<b>Table 7: Real Estate Excise Tax</b>			
	<b>Total REET Revenue</b>	<b>Parks</b>	<b>Economic Development</b>
Estimated REET Revenue – 2003	\$5,033,942	\$1,258,486	\$1,258,486
Estimated REET Revenue – 2004	\$5,272,343	\$1,318,086	\$1,318,086
Estimated REET Revenue – 2005	\$5,562,389	\$1,390,597	\$1,390,597
Estimated REET Revenue – 2006	\$5,870,588	\$1,467,647	\$1,467,647
Estimated REET Revenue – 2007	\$6,198,159	\$1,549,540	\$1,549,540
Estimated REET Revenue – 2008	<u>\$6,546,401</u>	<u>\$1,636,601</u>	<u>\$1,636,601</u>
<b>First .25% REET</b>	<b>\$17,241,911</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Second .25% REET</b>	<b>\$17,241,911</b>	<b>\$8,620,957</b>	<b>\$8,620,957</b>
<b>Total Available REET</b>	<b>\$34,483,822</b>	<b>\$8,620,957</b>	<b>\$8,620,957</b>

The estimate of \$34.5 million is available REET. However, considerable variance from the figures is possible. Careful monitoring of this revenue source will be needed throughout the six-year planning period, and changes in financing strategy may be called for in response to changing economic conditions.

## (2) Fund Balance:

Fund balance represents operating surpluses that have been accumulated by the County in past years. Best viewed as “non-renewable resources,” fund balances are available to finance major one-time expenditures. Appropriate expenditures might include County buildings and facilities. Fund balance is probably less appropriate as a funding source for parks acquisition and development because the expenditures included in this six-year plan are just a portion of the total 20-year parks program. An ongoing source of funds, such as the REET (see above) is needed to support the parks program.

Available fund balances needed to complete the financing of the capital facilities plan are shown in Table 8, below:

<b>Table 8: Fund Balances</b>	
Real Estate Excise Tax Fund Balance	3,400,000
Capital Fund Balance	<u>2,500,000</u>
<b>Total Fund Balance</b>	<b>5,900,000</b>

## (3) Summary:

Table 9, below, summarizes the total financial plan supporting the capital facilities program for the six-years from 2003 to 2008.

<b>Table 9: Summary</b>	
Total Expenditures	426,835,500
Earmarked Sources	-180,034,500
<b>General Purpose Funding Needed</b>	246,801,000
REET (existing)	<b>17,241,911</b>
REET (extended)	<b>17,241,911</b>
Fund Balance	5,900,000
<b>Total General Purpose Funding Available</b>	<b>40,383,822</b>

The “Extended” REET was enacted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2002.



## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

This section recaps the Board actions necessary to implement this financial plan, outlines the overall, long-term financial impact of this plan on the county, and highlights the role of the budget process in implementing, monitoring, and modifying this plan.

### **(1) IMPLEMENTATION ACTION NEEDED:**

As discussed above, a number of Board actions are needed to implement this financial plan. These include:

- Implementing a funding mechanism (such as a property tax or tipping fee) sufficient to generate enough funds for the Conservation Areas Acquisition Program.
- Establishing a funding mechanism (such as a county-wide utility) for the capital costs of water quality and drainage with a fee structure.
- Ensure that the rates charged by the County to its wholesale customers are adequate to repay bonds issued for expansions. Maintaining a sewer rate structure adequate to cover the costs of future expansion

### **(2) LONG-TERM FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Implementation of this financial plan will have an impact on the County's financial condition extending well beyond the six-year time horizon of the plan itself. While it is difficult to foresee the implications of these effects, it is important to be aware of them. The following points should be kept in mind:

- Most or all of the revenue from the existing Conservation Futures property tax levy will be committed to servicing bonds issued in 2002 for the next twenty years. Thus, a significant source of funding for the parks program contained in this plan will not be available again until the year 2022.
- Revenues from the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) are committed to servicing debt on the Jail Work Center, Juvenile Center, and Public Service Center. Revenues from the REET may be available to meet this need, depending upon economic and market conditions and other community needs.
- A portion of the Fund balance accumulated in recent years has been expended. This may limit the County's ability to meet unanticipated needs in future years.

### **(3) BUDGET PROCESS IMPLICATIONS:**

This document is a long-term plan. Responsibility for the year-to-year financial decisions needed to implement the plan will fall to the County's budget process. Key tasks the budget process will need to perform include the following:

- Monitoring economic conditions and revenue estimates and, when necessary, modifying the financial plan to address changing conditions.
- Monitoring project expenditures to ensure that they remain within planned levels and, when necessary, modifying the financial plan to address changing conditions.
- Deciding the timing of the expenditures and debt issuance within the six-year time frame of the financial plan.
- Managing operating expenditure levels to ensure adequate funding for the maintenance of capital facilities developed under this plan.
- Reviewing the needs and priorities of the community, and, when necessary, modifying the capital plan and its financial elements accordingly.

#### **(4) Impact on Households:**

In some areas, this financial plan calls for new fees or taxes. The following summarizes the estimated financial impact of the changes described on individual households. These are estimates only, and, in certain cases, the decisions needed to precisely quantify the impacts have not yet been made.

- **Transportation:** No new taxes or fees anticipated within the six -year time frame as outlined in this document.
- **Parks and Open Space:** A funding strategy will be needed to enable the Conservation Areas Acquisition Program. Originally contemplated using the Conservation REET, funding options also include a property tax and garbage tipping fees, among others.
- **Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality:** A funding strategy will be necessary to pay for the capital costs of stormwater and water quality
- **Wastewater Treatment:** The costs of expanding the wastewater treatment system will be charged back to individual ratepayers and new development by the County's wholesale customers. The exact costs to ratepayers will not be known until the Hazel Dell Sewer District and the City of Battleground develop these rates.
- **County Buildings and Other Facilities:** Future funding will likely come from voter approved bond.